CONCLUSIONS

Applicant believes that the Examiner's requirement for election and restriction is in error. Applicant has respectfully requested reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the request for election / restriction because of error. The Examiner has not provided a valid reason why the inventions listed in Groups I through IV do not relate to a single general concept under PCT 131. The Examiner stated that "applicant's Group I through IV claims lack the same or corresponding special technical feature". The Examiner continues with "because the corresponding technical feature is the use of Lo Han Kuo Extract as a sweetener in foods, such as ice cream.

Applicant asserts that his claims have a common special technical feature; and that the Examiner has wrongly characterized applicant's technical feature. Further, applicant's special technical feature is part of all of the claims in Groups I through IV, as well as new claims 30 to 32, linking them to constitute a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 Applicant's special technical feature comprises a novel synergistic mixture of Sucralose powder and Lo Han Kuo powder. The juice of Luo Han Guo, disclosed in the reference Sarama et al, is made from a different plant than that used to make applicant's powdered Lo Han Kuo extract, The reference Sarama et al neither teaches nor suggests applicant's invention.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw or modify the requirement for Election/Restriction and to allow all claims 17 through 32. In the event only Group II claims are approved by the Examiner, then applicant solicits the Examiner to combine and allow Groups II and III claims including new claims 31 and 32. These claims are linked together by the same special technical feature and have the same general inventive concept, as previously mentioned.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Brent, Reg. No. 18,459

Attorney fo Applicant